widely used * * * in inflammations of mucous membranes"; (oil of wintergreen) "Used in various forms of rheumatism Apply locally."

On March 14, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

22600. Misbranding of Blis-To-Sol. U. S. v. 57 Bottles of Blis-To-Sol. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31673. Sample no. 39391-A.)

Examination of the drug product involved in this case showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling; also that the label failed to declare the alcohol present in the article.

On or about December 7, 1933, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 57 bottles of Blis-To-Sol at Jacksonville, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about October 19, 1933, by the Blis-To-Sol Co., from Fitzgerald, Ga., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of salicylic acid (7.4 g per 100 ml), boric acid (1 g per 100 ml), alcohol (61 percent by volume), acetone (4.9 g per 100 ml), methyl sali-

cylate, glycerin, and water, colored with a yellow dye.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the package failed to bear upon its label a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the article. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements appearing in the labeling, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, were false and fraudulent: (Carton) "For * * * Tetter Eczema * * and other parasitic skin diseases * * * The diseased skin will scarf off feet * * * For Tetter—Eczema * * * For the S * Blistering For the Skin diseases known as * * * also tetter, eczema"; (bottle) "For * * * Tetter Eczema * * * and other parasitic skin diseases. * * * After three or four days the diseased skin will scarf off * * * for the skin diseases known as * * * Also tetter, eczema"; (circular) "Relieves hand tetter in 4 days * * * relieves eczema in 3 days * * * a most reliable remedy for * * * Eczema and Tetter. * * * It readily penetrates into remedy for * * * Eczema and Tetter. * * * It readily penetrates into the skin and kills the parasite * * * for * * * eczema * * * for * * * tetter, eczema * * * its effect upon the skin * * * when a person has an itching skin caused from eczema * * * Blistering * * the healing element seems to sink through the pores of the skin; the powerful antiseptic kills the disease germ and after a few applications you can remove the diseased skin, leaving a clean healthy skin. skin sufferers * * * For * * * Blistering and Aching feet. After about five to six applications the diseased skin will scarf off. For Eczema * * * For Sores * * * around the edges sores * * * If around the sores should small red pimples appear, be sure to apply full strength to these pimples. This will prevent them from making sores; it kills the infection. * * * it is very valuable for * * * sores; it kills the infection. * * * * for Itching Piles." boils

On May 18, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

22601. Misbranding of Kelfood. U. S. v. 71 Small Bottles, et al., of Kelfood. Default decree of destruction. (F. & D. no. 31796. Sample no. 61379-A.)

Examination of a sample of Kelfood showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling. The labeling was further objectionable since the article was represented to consist exclusively of products derived from the sea, whereas it contained ingredients derived from other sources.

On December 30, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court